UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,327	07/09/2003	Isaac J. William	OR01-I7301	2831

51067 7590 08/21/2008 PVF -- ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION c/o PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP 2820 FIFTH STREET DAVIS, CA 95618-7759	**EXAMINER** ALMATRAHI, FARIS S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 May 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1.   This action is in reply to applicant amendment filed May 28, 2008.

2.   Claims 1, 3, and 8-40 have been amended.

3.   Claim 41 has been cancelled.

4.   Claims 1-40 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 1-40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Maritzen et al (US Pat No. 5,987,429) in view of Bross et al. (US Publication No.

2003/0105687 A1).

7.   Regarding claims 1 and 21, Maritzen discloses a transaction tax determining

method comprising: receiving the transaction for which taxes are to be determined

(Abstract); examining a configurable template associated with a tax rule, wherein the

configurable template identifies a set of attributes associated with the transaction

(Column 1 line 57 – Column 2 line 5, Column 2 lines 40-56); examining a set of

conditions for the set of attributes (Column 2 lines 6-17); and when each condition in the

set of conditions is satisfied, using a process result associated with the set of conditions

in determining a tax for the transaction, wherein the process result indicates the

outcome of a process associated with the condition (Column 2 lines 6-17).

8.   Maritzen fails to explicitly disclose a method wherein the configurable template

has been configured by a user system to include drivers deemed necessary to facilitate

the configuration and reusability of the configurable template in the tax rules, wherein

the drivers are the attributes associated with the transaction, and wherein the tax rule is

produced by the computer system using the configurable template from abstracted tax

authority rules.

9.   However, Bross discloses a method wherein the configurable template has been

configured by a user system to include drivers deemed necessary to facilitate the

configuration and reusability of the configurable template in the tax rules, wherein the

drivers are the attributes associated with the transaction, and wherein the tax rule is

produced by the computer system using the configurable template from abstracted tax

authority rules (Abstract, Paragraphs [0121], [0140] – [0141]).

10.   Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to use the teachings of Bross in the device of Maritzen

reference to include a method wherein the configurable template has been configured

by a user system to include drivers deemed necessary to facilitate the configuration and

reusability of the configurable template in the tax rules, wherein the drivers are the

attributes associated with the transaction, and wherein the tax rule is produced by the

computer system using the configurable template from abstracted tax authority rules, for

the advantage of linking transaction tax related applications (Bross, Paragraph [0012]).

11.   Regarding claims 2 and 22, Maritzen discloses a method wherein if the set of

conditions is not satisfied and if an alternative set of conditions for the set of attributes is

satisfied, the method further comprises using an alternative process result associated

with the alternative set of conditions in determining the tax for the transaction (Column 2

lines 6-23).

12.   Regarding claims 3 and 23, Maritzen discloses a method wherein if the tax rule

does not apply to the transaction and additional tax rules exist, the method further

comprises attempting to apply the next tax rule in the order of precedence in the

process of determining and/or the transaction (Figures 4-5).

13.   Regarding claims 4 and 24, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the additional

tax rules are applied in a sequence determined by a precedence ordering of the

additional tax rules (Figure 2, Figures 4-5).

14.   Regarding claims 5 and 25, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the

precedence ordering allows the user to configure the system in a way that more specific

tax rules are applied before more general tax rules are applied (Figure 2).

15.   Regarding claims 6 and 26, Maritzen discloses a method further comprising

allowing a user to modify configurable templates associated with the tax rules (Column

6 lines 10-29).

16.   Regarding claims 7 and 27, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rule specifies whether or not a specific tax is applicable to the transaction (Column 8 lines 1-10).

17.   Regarding claims 8 and 28, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rule specifies a tax rate that is used in determining the tax amount for a tax applicable to the transaction (Column 8 lines 11-26).

18.   Regarding claims 9 and 29, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rule specifies a tax status that is used in determining the tax amount for a tax applicable to the transaction (Column 8 lines 11-26).

19.   Regarding claims 10 and 30, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rule specifies a taxable basis formula that is used in determining the tax amount for a tax applicable to the transaction (Column 2 line 66 – Column 3 line 4).

20.   Regarding claims 11 and 31, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rule specifies a tax calculation formula that is used in determining the tax amount for a tax applicable to the transaction (Abstract, Figure 2, Column 2 lines 40-56).

21.   Regarding claims 12 and 32, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rule specifies a tax recovery rate that is used in determining the tax recovery amount for a tax applicable to the transaction (Column 8 lines 11-26).

22.   Regarding claims 13 and 33, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rule specifies a result that is used in determining the outcome of any process of determining or administering taxes that are applicable to the transaction (Column 2 line 18-23).

23.   <u>Regarding claims 14 and 34</u>, Maritzen discloses a method wherein determining the tax for the transaction involves: determining which taxes are applicable to the transaction (Column 8 lines 1-10); determining a taxable basis for the transaction (Column 2 line 66 – Column 3 line 4); determining an applicable tax rate for the transaction (Column 8 lines 11-26); and calculating the tax for the transaction (Figure 5).

24.   <u>Regarding claims 15 and 35</u>, Maritzen discloses a method wherein different sets of tax rules can be associated with different local jurisdictions (Figure 2, Column 7 lines 1-6).

25.   <u>Regarding claims 16 and 36</u>, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rule, the configurable template and the set of conditions reside in a database (Figure 4).

26.   <u>Regarding claims 17 and 37</u>, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rules specified using configurable templates are applied to processes other than determining taxes such as processes of administering taxes (Figure 2).

27.   <u>Regarding claims 18 and 38</u>, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the tax rules specified using configurable templates are applied to a few but not all of the processes for determining or administering taxes (Figure 2).

28.   <u>Regarding claims 19 and 39</u>, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the system allows the tax rules to be created for a hierarchy of tax regimes in such a way as to allow the specification of a general rule for a higher-level regime, and increasingly specific rules down the regime hierarchy to the level of taxes in the lowest level of regime (Figure 2, Column 6 lines 31-51).

29.   <u>Regarding claims 20 and 40</u>, Maritzen discloses a method wherein the system

allows the tax rules to be defined for subscribers according to an open subscription

model that allows sharing of rules across subscribers in a subscription hierarchy (Figure

2, Column 6 lines 31-51).

Response to Arguments

30.   Applicant's arguments with respect to 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejections have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Faris Almatrahi whose telephone number is (571)270-
3326. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number
for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/F. Ryan Zeender/   Faris Almatrahi
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627   Examiner
                                                            Art Unit 3627

FA